



Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		<b>Docket Number (Optional)</b> 03226/037001; P5009	
		<b>Application Number</b> 09/778,424-Conf. #6879	<b>Filed</b> February 7, 2001
		<b>First Named Inventor</b> Joseph C.H. Park	
		<b>Art Unit</b> 2193	<b>Examiner</b> T. A. Vu
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> applicant /inventor.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number <u>45,079</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____</p> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.</p>			



Signature

Thomas K. Scherer

Typed or printed name

(713) 228-8600

Telephone number

March 17, 2006

Date



Docket No.: 03226/037001  
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

In re Patent Application of:  
Joseph C. H. Park

Conf. No.: 6879

Application No.: 09/778,424

Art Unit: 2193

Filed: February 7, 2001

Examiner: T. A. Vu

For: GENERAL AND EFFICIENT METHOD FOR  
TRANSFORMING PREDICATED  
EXECUTION TO STATIC SPECULATION

---

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Claims 1, 3-6, 10, 12-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Intel® IA-64 "Architecture Software Developer's Manual (hereinafter "IA-64") in view of "A Framework for Balancing Control Flow and Predication" by Hwu et al. (hereinafter "Hwu"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,637,026 issued to Chen (hereinafter "Chen").

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (See MPEP §2143).

In maintaining the above rejection and issuing a final office action, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to satisfy the requirements set out in MPEP §2143, which require that the cited prior art teach or suggest all claim limitations.

In particular, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner, in construing the claims, has failed to consider the claim limitations in their entirety.

Turning to the claims, the claims require if-converting an abstract internal representation, wherein the if-converting comprises, in part, writing Boolean data to a general register designated as a destination register based on the testing, the destination register corresponding to the conditional instruction and representing a predicate. The above limitation is addressed below.

As asserted in the Advisory Action mailed March 13, 2006, as well as in the Office Actions mailed April 21, 2005, and October 17, 2005, the Examiner has broadly interpreted the teachings of IA-64 to read on the pending claims. In particular, the Examiner has construed the teachings of IA-64, which is directed to software development for a particular processor architecture, to cover writing Boolean data to a general register designated as a destination register, the destination register corresponding to the conditional instruction and representing a predicate (*i.e.*, the Examiner asserts that using a general register to store predicate Boolean data is equivalent to designating a generic register, which, in effect, makes it a predicate register) (see Office Action dated October 17, 2005, at page 10; continuation sheet of Advisory Action mailed March 13, 2006).

The Applicant respectfully asserts that the broad interpretation of IA-64 is overreaching and has effectively removed explicitly stated limitations within the claims. In particular, the Examiner has construed teachings in IA-64 directed to storing predicates in specialized predicate registers (see Office Action dated October 17, 2005, at page 10) to be equivalent to the limitation that the if-converting comprises “writing Boolean data to a general register designated as a destination register based on the testing, the destination register corresponding to the conditional instruction and representing a predicate.” As

previously discussed in the Response to final Office Action mailed to the U.S. Patent Office on January 13, 2006, pp. 3-4, such an interpretation effectively reads out the limitation that Boolean data is written to a general register designated as a destination register. The use of a specialized predicate register is not equivalent to the use of a general register, and, in construing the claims, the Examiner has read out this limitation.

### Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the Examiner has failed to satisfy the requirements set forth in MPEP §2143 to establish a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, a favorable decision from the panel is respectfully requested. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/037001).

Dated: March 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas K. Scherer  
Registration No.: 45,079  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant